

Distinguishing models of surface response through the self-energy of an electron

Robert Bennett,¹ Stefan Yoshi Buhmann,¹ and Claudia Eberlein²

¹*Physikalisches Institut, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg,
Hermann-Herder-Str. 3, D-79104 Freiburg i. Br., Germany*

²*Department of Physics & Astronomy, University of Sussex, Falmer, Brighton BN1 9QH, UK
(Dated: October 6, 2016)*

Quantum electrodynamics near boundaries is investigated by considering the self-energy of an electron confined between parallel plates. The formalism of macroscopic quantum electrodynamics is used to describe the boundary-dependent fluctuating quantised vacuum field to which the electron is coupled, thereby endowing it with a surface-dependent self-energy. We derive a general formula for this energy shift and find that its sign is different for two commonly-used models of surface response, namely the plasma model and the Drude model. We propose an experiment which could detect this difference in sign, shedding light on continuing disagreements about the correct prescription for the interaction of low-frequency vacuum photons with media.

Quantum electrodynamics is an extremely successful description of the interaction between charges and electromagnetic fields. One of its most remarkable predictions is the existence of a fluctuating ground state, variously known as the zero-point energy or vacuum field. Often cited as a evidence that vacuum fluctuations are ‘real’ is the attractive force between parallel plates arising from the imposition of boundary conditions on the vacuum field, this is the famous Casimir effect [1]. Beginning with the pioneering work of Sparnaay in 1957 [2], there have been a string of experiments measuring the Casimir force in various situations [3–6]. An unexpected result was seen in [6], where it was found that theory and experiment agree if a lossless plasma model is used for the surfaces, and the apparently more realistic Drude model of a dissipative surface makes predictions inconsistent with experiment. Even more curiously, a later experiment [7] produced the *opposite* conclusion — its results fit with the Drude model and not the undamped plasma. This has led to considerable amount of discussion over the last decade or so [8].

More generally, experiments aiming to measure the Casimir force between two macroscopic objects are notoriously plagued with uncontrolled errors, including patch potentials, surface roughness, eddy currents, thermal effects, current stability, plate alignment and equipment calibration. It is a natural further question to ask if there are any further experiments on the surface-dependent vacuum QED that for which theory predicts strongly differing results depending on whether a Drude or plasma model is used to describe the surfaces. Use of microscopic particles (for example atoms, ions, electrons or nanoparticles) rather than macroscopic objects is a promising route as their properties (decay rates, frequency shifts etc) can be measured very precisely. On top of this, microscopic objects are immune to some of the effects listed above (e.g. plate alignment, roughness), and are less affected by others. Previously it has been shown that a single electron interacting with an infinite half-space is a rich test-bed for different models of surface-dependent ef-

fects due to its extreme sensitivity to the low-frequency response of the medium [9, 10], which can drastically change depending upon the choice of model. Here we will first use the formalism of macroscopic QED [11] to generalise this result to arbitrary geometries, and then consider a specific case for which we also propose an experiment that could conclusively determine whether Drude or plasma response is appropriate for a given material.

We begin by considering a single electron of momentum $\mathbf{p}$, minimally coupled to the electromagnetic field $\{\Phi, \mathbf{A}\}$, so that the interaction Hamiltonian is $H_{\text{int}} = -\frac{e}{m}\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{A} + e\Phi$. In macroscopic QED, the components of the vector potential at position $\mathbf{r}$ in a system composed of material bodies of permittivity $\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}, \omega)$ may be expressed in terms of the bosonic operators $\hat{a}_j^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, \omega)$ and $\hat{a}_j(\mathbf{r}, \omega)$ respectively create or destroy one excitation of the combined matter-field system via [12]

$$\hat{A}_i(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^\infty d\omega \omega \int d^3\mathbf{r}' \sqrt{\text{Im} \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}', \omega)} \times \mathbf{G}_{ij}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}', \omega) \hat{a}_j(\mathbf{r}', \omega) + \text{H.c.} \quad (1)$$

where all geometric properties are encoded via the (classical) electromagnetic Green’s function $\mathbf{G}$, defined to satisfy

$$\nabla \times \nabla \times \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}', \omega) - \omega^2 \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}, \omega) \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}', \omega) = \mathbb{I}_2 \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'),$$

Labelling a state with momentum $\mathbf{p}$ and N matter-field excitations by $|\mathbf{p}; N\rangle$, postponing discussion of the static contribution from Φ one has for the lowest-order momentum-dependent energy shift of the vacuum state

$$\Delta E = \frac{e^2}{m^2} \sum_{\mathbf{p}'} \frac{|\langle \mathbf{p}'; 1 | \mathbf{p} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{A}} | \mathbf{p}; 0 \rangle|^2}{E - E'} \quad (2)$$

where E is the unperturbed energy of the initial state and primed quantities are those relevant to the intermediate state. Using the following relation for the dyadic Green’s




FIG. 1. The system we consider, where an electron of non-relativistic momentum $p_{\parallel}$ moves in the transverse (x or y) direction between two parallel plates of permittivity $\epsilon(\omega)$ placed at $z = 0$ and $z = d$.

function (see, for example, [13]);

$$\omega^2 \int d^3 \mathbf{r}' [\text{Im} \epsilon(\mathbf{r}', \omega)] \mathbf{G}_{il}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}', \omega) \mathbf{G}_{lj}^*(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}'', \omega) = \text{Im} \mathbf{G}_{ij}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'', \omega), \quad (3)$$

one finds for the energy shift (2) in the no-recoil approximation (see [9, 10])

$$\Delta E = \frac{ie^2}{2\pi m^2} \langle p_i^2 \rangle \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{\omega} \mathbf{G}_{ii}^{\text{sc}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}, \omega), \quad (4)$$

where we have isolated surface-dependent effects by replacing $\mathbf{G}$ with its scattering part $\mathbf{G}^{\text{sc}}$ — this is the portion of the Green's function that vanishes if all boundaries are removed. The Green's function $\mathbf{G}^{\text{sc}}$ has no poles in the upper half of the complex- ω plane, so the entire shift integral can be worked out from its residue at $\omega = 0$;

$$\Delta E = -\frac{e^2}{2m^2} \langle p_i^2 \rangle \text{Res}_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbf{G}_{ii}^{\text{sc}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}, \omega)}{\omega}. \quad (5)$$

Equation (5) is a new formula, containing all previous results for the surface-dependent self-energy (which can also be interpreted as a shift in mass) in specific situations (see [9, 10, 14]), but is valid for arbitrary surface geometry and material properties. To find the self-energy for a particular geometry one simply inserts the relevant scattering Green's tensor. For example, in the particular case of parallel perfectly conducting plates as considered in [14] and shown in Fig. 1, the Green's tensor [15] expressed as a two-dimensional Fourier transform over parallel wave-vectors $k_{\parallel}$ is simple enough that the resulting $k_{\parallel}$ integral appearing in Eq. (5) can be carried out analytically. Defining $\zeta = z/d$ one finds after some algebra the self-energy shift between perfectly conducting plates;

$$\Delta E_{\text{PC}}(\zeta) = \frac{e^2 \langle p_{\parallel}^2 \rangle}{32m^2 \pi d} \left\{ \pi \cot(\pi \zeta) - 2 \left[\mathcal{H}_{3-\zeta} + \frac{3\zeta^2 - 12\zeta + 11}{(\zeta - 3)(\zeta - 2)(\zeta - 1)} \right] \right\} \quad (6)$$

where $\mathcal{H}_n \equiv \sum_{k=1}^n k^{-1}$. The above result agrees with [14]. Expanding for small ζ one finds that the leading term is given by $e^2 \langle p_{\parallel}^2 \rangle / (32\pi m^2 z)$, in agreement with previous single-plate work [9, 10] obtained via a normal-mode quantization rather than macroscopic QED.

In realistic situations one requires more complex models of the surface response, for example the plasma model defined by

$$\epsilon_p(\omega) = 1 - \frac{\omega_p^2}{\omega^2}, \quad (7)$$

or the Drude model defined by

$$\epsilon_D(\omega) = 1 - \frac{\omega_p^2}{\omega^2 - \omega_T^2 + i\gamma\omega}. \quad (8)$$

In these situations, even the integrands become somewhat unwieldy so are relegated to supplemental material. It is interesting to note that the Drude model frequency integral may again be carried out analytically, but the result contains hundreds of terms so is not particularly illuminating as compared to simply doing the integral numerically. Nevertheless, we agree with previous Drude model work for small ζ [10] and can still quote a reasonably compact new analytic result for the shift at $\zeta = 1/2$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta E_D^{\text{mid}} = & -\frac{e^2 \langle p_{\parallel}^2 \rangle}{256\pi m^2 d^3 \eta(0)^2} \\ & \times \left\{ 16d^2 \eta(0)^3 + 8[\eta(0) - 1]^4 \ln[\eta(0) + 1] \varepsilon'(0)^2 \right. \\ & + \left[(\eta(0) - 1)^2 (2\eta(0)\varepsilon''(0) + (\eta(0)^2 - 1)\varepsilon'(0)^2) \right. \\ & \left. \left. \times (\eta(0)\Phi[\eta(0)^2, 2, 1/2] + 4\text{Li}_2[\eta(0)] - 3\text{Li}_2[\eta(0)^2]) \right] \right\} \quad (9) \end{aligned}$$

where $\varepsilon'(0) \equiv [d\varepsilon(\omega)/d\omega]|_{\omega=0}$, $\varepsilon''(0) \equiv [d^2\varepsilon(\omega)/d\omega^2]|_{\omega=0}$ and $\eta(\omega) \equiv (\varepsilon(\omega) - 1)/(\varepsilon(\omega) + 1)$. We have made use of the polylogarithm function $\text{Li}_s(x) \equiv \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{x^k}{k^s}$ and the ‘Lerch transcendent’ $\Phi(x, s, \alpha) \equiv \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^k}{(k+\alpha)^s}$.

We plot the ζ dependence of the shift in Fig. 2, where we see the unexpected effect that the energy shift has a different sign than for the Drude and plasma models. The physical origin of this is that TE (transverse electric) modes dominate the shift, and the Fresnel reflection coefficient for such modes behaves very differently at low frequencies depending on whether Drude or plasma models are used for the permittivity. The limit $\omega \rightarrow 0$ of the former is $\omega_p^2/(\omega_p^2 + 2\omega_T^2)$, which is ≈ 0.989 for gold. The latter remains a function of $k_{\parallel}$ even when the $\omega \rightarrow 0$ limit is taken, but using the fact that all $k_{\parallel}$ integrals are effectively cut off by exponential damping factors, one can show that for all the relevant parts of the integral and with the plasma frequency of gold, the TE reflection coefficient is -1 to a very good approximation, showing the




FIG. 2. Surface-dependent self-energy for Drude and plasma models, as a function of position z between plates separated by a distance d . Here we have scaled the energy by the energy shift E_0 of the electron at the midpoint between parallel perfect conductors, obtained from Eq. (6) by setting $\zeta = 1/2$ with result (in S.I. units) $E_0 = e^2 p_{\parallel}^2 \ln 2 / (8\pi\epsilon_0 c^2 m^2 d)$. This is approximately equal to $8 \times 10^{-28} \text{ J}$ ($\sim 5 \text{ neV}$) for an electron moving at $0.01c$ in a $10 \mu\text{m}$ -wide gold cavity ($\omega_p = 1.37 \times 10^{16} \text{ Hz}$, $\gamma = 4.05 \times 10^{13} \text{ Hz}$ and $\omega_T \approx 10^{15} \text{ Hz}$ [16])

sign discrepancy relative to the Drude model. A sign flip is the kind of feature that is relatively easy to measure experimentally, so in the following sections we explore a possible method for experimental diagnosis of whether Drude or plasma models are more appropriate for a given surface.

An experiment aiming to measure the shift discussed above must involve an electron that can be moved in and out of proximity to a surface, and ideally it should also be set up in a way that the experimental observable depends as strongly as possible on the sign of the dynamical force found from (5), which of course is an addition to the ever-present (and much larger, at least in a non-relativistic setting) electrostatic force. For example, sending an electron beam through a cavity in an experiment analogous to the Casimir-Polder force experiment of [17] and attempting to observe the momentum-dependence of the deflection would be extremely difficult as the Drude/plasma difference in the $\mathcal{O}(v/c)^2$ dynamical force would show up as an unobservably tiny additional deflection to that given by the purely electrostatic (velocity-independent) force [18]. Thus a radically different approach is required, for which we propose the setup shown in Fig. 3. Here, an electron undergoes cyclotron motion in a tube extending halfway around a circle (a ‘half-cyclotron’) and ultimately we will show that with reasonable parameters the Drude and plasma models could be distinguished by observing what type of magnetic field modulation is required to keep the electron in persistent cyclotron motion.

We describe the apparatus by considering the electron




FIG. 3. Schematic of the proposed ‘half-cyclotron’ experimental setup, where half of the electron’s cyclotron orbit is subject to a surface-dependent correction and half is not.

to be ‘free’ (aside from the magnetic field causing cyclotron motion) when in the region $0 < \theta < \pi$, while in the region $\pi < \theta < 2\pi$ it is considered as confined in the tube. In this first proof-of-principle calculation we take $R \gg d$ and hence ignore edge effects in the transition regions $\theta \approx 0$ and $\theta \approx \pi$ (though in principle these could be estimated from known exact Green’s functions for systems with edges [19]), giving for the force acting on the electron:

$$F(\theta) = \begin{cases} F_{\text{free}} & \text{for } 0 < \theta \leq \pi \\ F_{\text{conf}} & \text{for } \pi < \theta \leq 2\pi \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

Additionally the assumption $R \gg d$ means that the curved section can be considered locally as parallel plates, so the force F_{conf} up to order $\langle p_{\parallel}^2 \rangle$ can be obtained from the results of the previous section. Thus we have a prescription that allows us to consider the forces upon an electron that moves around the complete circle. The acceleration of the electron should have a negligible effect on the electron-plate interaction itself as the parameters we will choose are well within the regime where the acceleration is much less than c^2/z [20].

Considering first the free region, the force on the circulating electron is given simply by the cyclotron expression; $F_{\text{free}} = evB_0$ with B_0 as appropriate to cause the electron’s cyclotron radius to match the radius of curvature of the tube. The electron then passes through the confined region, where, assuming it is not exactly in the center of the tube, it gains an additional surface dependence. This will cause the electron to leave its circular orbit meaning that the applied B_0 is no longer appropriate for cyclotron motion. In order to remedy this, one has to change the magnetic field by an amount ΔB in such a way that the effective force on the electron (when it is in the confined region) is always evB_0 , i.e. we choose ΔB so that $ev(B_0 + \Delta B) + F_{\text{surf}} = evB_0$ is satisfied, meaning




FIG. 4. Field modulation strength required to keep an electron with velocity $v = \beta c$ in cyclotron motion in the apparatus shown in Fig. 3. Here the width of the cavity is taken as $d = 10 \mu\text{m}$, and the various positions z for the electron are taken as indicated in the figure. The solid lines (red for plasma, blue for Drude as indicated) represent the results with all dynamical effects included, while the dashed (Drude) and dotted (plasma) lines are those when only the static terms are taken. Since the electron is undergoing cyclotron motion, each velocity implies a particular magnetic field strength (for a given radius), given simply via $B = (mc/e)\beta/R \approx (0.0017 \text{ T}\cdot\text{m})\beta/R$ — this magnetic field (for $R = 1\text{mm}$) is indicated on the upper axis.

that the required field modulation is $\Delta B = -F_{\text{surf}}/(e\beta c)$ where $\beta \equiv v/c$.

The surface force F_{surf} consists of an electrostatic part, as well as the first dynamical correction calculated in the previous sections. The electrostatic part can be found via textbook calculation and is given by

$$F_{\text{static}} = \frac{\eta(0)e^2}{16\pi d^2} [\Phi(\eta(0)^2, 2, 1 - \zeta) - \Phi(\eta(0)^2, 2, \zeta)] \quad (11)$$

Initially taking into account just the electrostatic part of the force, one has $\Delta B_{\text{static}} = -F_{\text{static}}/(e\beta c)$ for the required field modulation. The static force is of course independent of β , so the quantity $\beta\Delta B_{\text{static}}$ is constant in β , as demonstrated in Fig. 4. If we now derive a force F_{dyn} from the dynamical energy shift ΔE via $F_{\text{dyn}} = -d\Delta E/dz$, we can then add this to the electrostatic part to find the required field modulation when dynamical corrections are taken into account;

$$\Delta B = -\frac{F_{\text{static}} + F_{\text{dyn}}(\beta)}{e\beta c}, \quad (12)$$

Now the product $\beta\Delta B$ will no longer be constant in β , as demonstrated by the solid lines in Fig. 4. It is important to note that Fig. 4 pushes the bounds of our model (large velocities) and of experimental reality (small distances) in order to demonstrate a general trend. For the




FIG. 5. Relative field correction factor M needed in order to preserve cyclotron motion when dynamical surface effects are included at $z = 1 \mu\text{m}$. If no dynamical surface effects were present, one would have $M = 0$. Inset: Schematic representation of the time dependence of the B -field required to preserve cyclotron motion for both models.

more realistic situation of smaller velocities and larger distances, it is more convenient to investigate the dimensionless quantity M , defined as;

$$M \equiv -\frac{F_{\text{dyn}}}{F_{\text{static}}} = \frac{\Delta B}{\Delta B_{\text{static}}} - 1 \quad (13)$$

where the equality follows from Eq. (12) and the definition of ΔB_{static} [21]. This quantity is a measure of how large the field modulation that preserves cyclotron motion needs to be if all dynamical corrections are included, relative to that required if there were no dynamical effects. For perfect reflectors, the small ζ approximation of M is particularly simple: $M_{\text{PM}}(\zeta \approx 0) = \frac{\beta^2}{4} + \mathcal{O}(\zeta^3)$, while for realistic models we plot $|M|$ in Fig. 5. For example, given a magnetic field of $0.035 \text{ T} = 350 \text{ G}$ one would have to add or subtract a modulation with a relative magnitude of 10^{-4} , which is 100 parts per million (ppm). Magnetic field sources routinely have stability in the $0.1 - 5 \text{ ppm}$ scale [22, 23], and in extreme cases can approach one part per billion [24]. This means that with routinely-achievable magnetic field stability the required modulation would be approximately three orders of magnitude larger than the background magnetic field instability.

In this work we have derived a general formula for the shift in the self-energy of an electron in arbitrary environments. We have applied this to the situation of identical

parallel plates, reproducing in the relevant regime earlier results obtained by normal-mode quantization near a single plate. We found an unexpected result whereby the dynamical shift for Drude and plasma models of the surface are of different signs, and approximately the same magnitude. We then outlined a cyclotron motion-based experiment that takes advantage of this specific feature of our results in order to distinguish whether a Drude or plasma model is more appropriate for a given surface. This experiment would provide a reliable probe of the character of the low-frequency response of materials to vacuum fields.

Acknowledgements: This work was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (grants BU 1803/3-1476) the UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) and the Freiburg Institute for Advanced Studies.

-
- [1] H. Casimir, *Proc. K. Ned. Akad.* **360**, 793 (1948).
 - [2] M. J. Sparnaay, *Nature* **180**, 334 (1957).
 - [3] S. K. Lamoreaux, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 5 (1997); *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 5475 (1998).
 - [4] U. Mohideen and A. Roy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 4549 (1998).
 - [5] D. M. Harber, J. M. Obrecht, J. M. McGuirk, and E. A. Cornell, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 033610 (2005).
 - [6] R. S. Decca, D. López, E. Fischbach, G. L. Klimchitskaya, D. E. Krause, and V. M. Mostepanenko, *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 077101 (2007).
 - [7] A. O. Sushkov, W. J. Kim, D. A. R. Dalvit, and S. K. Lamoreaux, *Nat. Phys.* **7**, 230 (2011).
 - [8] M. Boström and B. Sernelius, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 4757 (2000); V. B. Svetovoy and R. Esquivel, *Phys. Rev. E* **72**, 036113 (2005); I. Brevik, S. A. Ellingsen, and K. A. Milton, *New J. Phys.* **8**, 236 (2006); W. J. Kim, M. Brown-Hayes, D. A. R. Dalvit, J. H. Brownell, and R. Onofrio, *Phys. Rev. A* **78**, 020101 (2008); R. S. Decca, E. Fischbach, G. L. Klimchitskaya, D. E. Krause, D. López, U. Mohideen, and V. M. Mostepanenko, *Phys. Rev. A* **79**, 026101 (2009); W. J. Kim, M. Brown-Hayes, D. A. R. Dalvit, J. H. Brownell, and R. Onofrio, *Phys. Rev. A* **79**, 026102 (2009); M. Bordag, G. Klimchitskaya, U. Mohideen, and V. Mostepanenko, *Advances in the Casimir Effect*, International Series of Monographs on Physics (OUP Oxford, 2009); R. Guérout, A. Lambrecht, K. A. Milton, and S. Reynaud, *Phys. Rev. E* **90**, 042125 (2014); G. L. Klimchitskaya and V. M. Mostepanenko, *Phys. Rev. E* **94**, 026101 (2016); R. Guérout, A. Lambrecht, K. A. Milton, and S. Reynaud, *Phys. Rev. E* **94**, 026102 (2016).
 - [9] C. Eberlein and D. Robaschik, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 233602 (2004).
 - [10] R. Bennett and C. Eberlein, *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 062505 (2012).
 - [11] T. Gruner and D.-G. Welsch, *Phys. Rev. A* **51**, 3246 (1995).
 - [12] We use natural units $\hbar = c = \epsilon_0 = 1$ throughout unless otherwise specified.
 - [13] H. T. Dung, L. Knöll, and D.-G. Welsch, *Phys. Rev. A* **57**, 3931 (1998).
 - [14] G. Barton and N. S. J. Fawcett, *Phys. Rep.* **170**, 1 (1988).
 - [15] M. S. Tomaš, *Phys. Rev. A* **51**, 2545 (1995).
 - [16] M. A. Ordal, R. J. Bell, R. W. Alexander, L. L. Long, and M. R. Querry, *Appl. Opt.* **24**, 4493 (1985).
 - [17] C. I. Sukenik, M. G. Boshier, D. Cho, V. Sandoghdar, and E. A. Hinds, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 560 (1993).
 - [18] For example an electron $1\mu\text{m}$ away from a conducting surface will be electrostatically attracted to its image, causing it to encounter the surface in about 0.1ns, setting an upper bound on the time for which the electron can be used. If it is moving parallel to the surface at a speed of 0.1c, the dynamical force calculated here causes an additional deflection of the order 1nm.
 - [19] C. Eberlein and R. Zietal, *Phys. Rev. A* **75**, 032516 (2007); *Phys. Rev. A* **80**, 012504 (2009).
 - [20] J. Marino, A. Noto, and R. Passante, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 020403 (2014).
 - [21] A minus sign has been included in the definition of M to make its sign coincide with that for the required field modulation in the region of interest (near $z = 0$), since $F_{\text{static}} < 0$ there.
 - [22] R. M. Carey, W. Earle, E. Efsthadiadis, M. F. Hare, E. S. Hazen, B. J. Hughes, F. Krienen, J. P. Miller, V. Monich, J. Ouyang, O. Rind, B. L. Roberts, L. R. Sulak, A. Trofimov, G. Varner, W. A. Worstell, E. Benedict, I. Logashenko, J. Benante, H. N. Brown, G. Bunce, J. Cullen, G. T. Danby, J. Geller, H. Hseuh, J. W. Jackson, L. Jia, S. Kochis, R. Larsen, Y. Y. Lee, M. Mapes, W. Meng, W. M. Morse, C. Pai, C. Pearson, I. Polk, R. Prigl, S. Rankowitz, J. Sandberg, Y. K. Semertzidis, R. Shutt, L. Snydstrup, A. Soukas, A. Stillman, T. Talerico, M. Tanaka, F. Toldo, D. von Lintig, D. Warburton, K. Woodle, A. Chertovskikh, V. P. Druzhinin, G. V. Fedotov, D. N. Grigorev, V. B. Golubev, B. I. Khazin, A. Maksimov, Y. Merzliakov, N. Ryskulov, S. Serednyakov, Y. M. Shatunov, E. Solodov, Y. Orlov, D. Winn, A. Grossmann, J. Gerhaeuser, K. Jungmann, P. von Walter, G. zu Putlitz, B. Bunker, W. Deninger, P. T. Debevec, D. W. Hertzog, T. D. Jones, C. Polly, S. Sedykh, D. Urner, U. Haebleren, K. Endo, H. Hirabayashi, S. Kurokawa, A. Yamamoto, M. A. Green, P. Cushman, J. Kindem, L. Duong, S. Giron, R. McNabb, D. Miller, C. Timmermans, D. Zimmerman, Y. Mizumachi, M. Iwasaki, H. E. Ahn, H. Deng, S. K. Dhawan, A. Disco, F. J. M. Farley, X. Fei, M. Grosse-Perdekamp, V. W. Hughes, D. Kawall, S. I. Redin, and A. Steinmetz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 1632 (1999).
 - [23] J. L. Roberts, N. R. Claussen, S. L. Cornish, E. A. Donley, E. A. Cornell, and C. E. Wieman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 4211 (2001).
 - [24] B. Odom, D. Hanneke, B. D'Urso, and G. Gabrielse, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 030801 (2006).